



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/270,256	03/15/1999	ILYA KLEBANOV	0100.9900440	2265
23418	7590	10/19/2004	EXAMINER	
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHLZ			YANG, RYAN R	
222 N. LASALLE STREET				
CHICAGO, IL 60601			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2672	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/270,256	KLEBANOV, ILYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit Ryan R Yang	2672

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ryan R Yang.

(3) Themis Anagnos

(2) Jeffrey Bixler

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9/24/04

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Noble et al. (5,657,046)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

1. Discussed the window as claimed; examiner consider the window is not clear distinguishable from the monitor display in Noble.
2. Discussed active video as claimed v.s. static video in Noble.
Examiner consider the active video is not clearly defined to be differentiable from Noble.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Ryan Yang
Examiner's signature, if required